

Appl No. 09/113,090  
Amdt. Dated September 4, 2003  
Reply to Office action of June 4, 2003

14

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Examiner has restated his obviousness objection to claim 6 on the basis of Misawa (US 5,282,044) in view of Suzuki (US 6,552,821).
2. In reply, the Applicant notes that Suzuki was filed on 17 July 1998, seven days after the U.S. filing date of the present application. Suzuki therefore does not form part of the prior art for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Nevertheless, the Applicant has voluntarily amended claim 6 in order to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. The Examiner's attention is drawn to the arguments in paragraph 2(a) of our previous response which clearly show why the video camera shake correction techniques of Misawa would not be suitable in a camera which captures still images.

In order to more clearly show that the claimed invention concerns the capture and deblurring of still images, claim 6 has been amended to refer to "*an image sensor adapted to capture a still, blurred image comprising at least one blurred pixel*" and in which the processor is "*adapted to ... process said blurred image ... to deblur said at least one blurred pixel of said blurred image and to output said deblurred still image*". It is clear that neither the mechanical shake correction technique nor the electronic shake correction technique disclosed in Misawa involve a processor which processes still images, nor do they involve the deblurring of individual pixels in a captured blurred still image.

For these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 6 is both novel and inventive over the prior art.

4. Applicant notes that the obviousness objections raised in relation to claims 7 and 8 depend upon Suzuki being part of the prior art for obviousness purposes. This, however is not the case. In addition, since claim 6 is novel and inventive, the Applicant submits that claims 7 and 8 are similarly novel and inventive.

Appln No. 09/113,090  
Amndt. Dated September 4, 2003  
Reply to Office action of June 4, 2003

15

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK



---

PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711